

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1-2 and 7-14, and has canceled claims 3-6, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicant is not conceding in this patent application that said amended and canceled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue said amended and canceled claims, and other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner indicated claims 1, 2 and 7-24 are allowed. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowed subject matter.

FIGS. 3B, 3D, and 5B have been amended via Replacement Sheets 7, 9, and 11, respectively, of the drawings.

The Examiner objected to the specification because of informalities.

The Examiner objected to the drawings.

Applicant respectfully traverses the specification and drawings objections with the following arguments.

Specification Objection:

The Examiner objected to the Specification because of informalities.

The Examiner argues: “The term "rectangle" on Page 3 should be amended to - rectangle - so that the term is spelled correctly... The term "ouput" on Page 4 should be amended to - output - so that the term is spelled correctly... The sentence "All the other cells within the left column are left empty as no measurement information is available to fill them" on Page 17 (the last sentence on the page) should be amended to — All the other cells within the ~~left~~right column are left empty as no measurement information is available to fill them — so that it corresponds with what is illustrated in Figure 3A. That is, in Figure 3A, many cells in the right column are left empty.”

In response, Applicant has amended the specification in accordance with the preceding suggestions by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Drawings Objection:

The Examiner objected to the drawings.

The Examiner argues: "Figure 3B should be designated by a legend such as — PRIOR ART —".

In response, Applicants have amended Figure 3B in accordance with the preceding suggestions by the Examiner.

The Examiner argues:

"The drawings are objected to because Figures 3C and 3D do not correspond to the description in the Specification. The Specification expressly states:

Furthermore the FIG 3D shows how a preferred embodiment of the present invention reacts upon the introduction of a new sample. The conventional means such as the fill-by-example operation do not react to the introduction of a new sample; or to the modification of an existing sample or to the deletion of an existing sample. The present invention dynamically updates the filled values within the range of cells as soon as a sample value is either added, or changed, or deleted. In the example of FIG 3D, a new sample (the middle cell in the table corresponding to $x = 75$) is introduced: its measured value **-10** supersedes the previous ones **-4** which was obtained by the fill-by-sample operation. As a result, the values of the neighbour cells are updated to take into account the new sample."

See *Specification* -- Page 19, first partial paragraph, third through seventh sentences. For

purposes of discussion, the examiner interprets Figure 3C to correspond to the "previous" sample values and Figure 3D to correspond to the "new" sample values.

Figures 3C and 3D do not correspond to the description in the Specification because: 1) in the table displayed in Figure 3C, the "previous" sample value for $x=75$ is -5 (not -4); 2) in the table displayed in Figure 3D, the "new" sample value for $x=75$ is -5 (not -10); and 3) in the table displayed in Figure 3D, many of the "new" sample values are incorrect and do not match the corresponding points in the graph (because it appears that the table displayed in Figure 3C was simply copied and pasted into Figure 3D without properly updating the "new" sample values).

Applicant must amend Figures 3C and 3D to correspond with the Specification.”

In response with respect to Figure 3C, Applicant notes that the $F(X)$ values in the table are the same as the plotted values of $F(X)$ in Figure 3C. Therefore, Figure 3C is self consistent and is not being amended. The value of “-4” at $X=75$ in the specification is a typographical error, which is being corrected by amendment herein by being changed to “-5” at $X=75$ in conformity with Figure 3C.

In response with respect to Figure 3D , the Examiner correctly states that “the table displayed in Figure 3C was simply copied and pasted into Figure 3D without properly updating the "new" sample values”. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Figure 4C to change the $F(X)$ values in the table to the “new” values, which are the plotted values of $F(X)$ in Figure 3D.

Thus, Applicant has amended Figure 3D and the specification in a manner that makes Figures 3C and 3D and the specification mutually consistent without adding new matter.

The Examiner argues: “The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the "Fill by Sample" field in the list box of the "Fill" dialog box, as described in the Specification (see *Specification* -- Page 22, first partial paragraph, second sentence). See Figure 5B, where it appears that the "Fill by Sample" option (element #511) does not include the proper text (i.e., Fill by Sample) in the highlighted field.”

In response, Applicant has amended Figure 5B to insert “Fill by Sample” in the location referred to by reference numeral 511.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM). The Attorney's reference number for this case is END-8241.

Date: January 28, 2011

/Jack P. Friedman/
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Customer No. 30449
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850 Telephone
(518) 220-1857 Facsimile
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com